EFW

Docket No.: 101-1019

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Hyun-kyu YUN

Application No.:	10/808,341	Group Art Unit No.:	2189
Filed:	March 25, 2004	Examiner	Woo H. CHOI
Customer No.:	38209	Confirmation No.	5441

For: DSP (DIGITAL SIGNAL PROCESSING) ARCHITECTURE WITH A WIDE MEMORY BANDWIDTH AND A MEMORY MAPPING METHOD THEREOF

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, Virginia 22313

Sir:

The Examiner has issued an Office Action, dated September 10, 2007, requiring an election of one of four allegedly separate inventions. For at least the reasons indicated below, Applicant respectfully requests clarification of contradictory and confusing statements by the Examiner prior to making any election.

In the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Invention II, directed to claims 11 and 17, which have already been allowed by the Examiner, is distinct from the other inventions since "**none of the structures** of the other inventions **require the use of two different ports to store data in a column or row direction** as claimed in invention II. The structures can be used to store data through one port in one direction only or though [sic] one or more ports in no particular direction," (emphases added). *See* Detailed Action, page 3, item 2. The Examiner then states that "[p]hysical configuration of III, of **having a middle row connected to one port** and **middle column connected to another port** is also quite distinct from the other two inventions [I and IV]," (emphases added). *See* Detailed Action, page 3, item 3. It is respectfully submitted that there is contradiction where the Examiner first states that none of the other allegedly distinct inventions is like that of claims 11 and 17, since they do not use two different ports to store data in a row or column, and then states that invention III is different because it uses two different ports for a row and for a column. Consequently, election of one of

Groups II and III cannot be made until further clarification is made to rectify this contradiction.

Further, the Examiner alleges that a serious burden would be placed on the Examiner if restriction is not required because "the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art," and because "the inventions require a different field of search." However, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of the pending claims has already been searched and considered, and, as indicated above, claims 11 and 17 have even been allowed. No substantive amendments have been made to independent claims 1 and 14, and yet these claims are now alleged to be distinct inventions I and III. Claim 11, which stands as originally presented, and claim 17, which has not been amended since allowance thereof, have both been allowed. Now, however, claims 11 and 17 require a new search under class 711/149, which allegedly places a serious burden on the Examiner. It appears that the Examiner is implying that the previous search was somehow deficient. Applicant respectfully submits that it is not a serious burden on the Examiner to correct a previous deficient search, should this be the case. Similar reasoning applies to Groups I and III, since these claims have not been substantially amended to the extent that would require a new field of search. Thus, further clarification is requested as to why a new search is required on the claims of Groups I-III, as well as to why a search is required of claims already searched and determined by the Examiner to be patentable, prior to an election thereof.

Applicant fully understands the Examiner's duty to protect the public. However, Applicant cannot make an election of any of the allegedly separate inventions until the contradictory and unclear statements discussed above have been clarified, and it is respectfully requested that such clarifications be made in a Supplemental Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

Date: October 9, 2007

By: _____.

Patrick J. Stanzione
Registration No.: 40,434

Stanzione & Kim, LLP
919 18th St., NW, Suite 440
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: 202-775-1900
Facsimile: 202-775-1901